

REMARKS

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-31 are pending in this application. New Claim 31 is herein submitted. No new matter is believed to be added.<sup>1</sup>

Claims 18-21, 24-25, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 5,072,155 to Sakurai et al. (herein “Sakurai”). Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sakurai in view of U.S. patent 6,011,704 to Coleman. Claims 26 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sakurai in view of U.S. patent application publication 2002/0027412 to Yoshida et al. (herein “Yoshida”). Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sakurai in view of U.S. patent 6,685,803 to Lazarovich et al. (herein “Lazarovich”). The above-noted rejections are traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Each of the above-noted rejections relies on Sakurai to fully meet the claim limitations, or at least as the primary reference in each rejection. Applicants respectfully submit the outstanding rejection is, however, misconstruing the disclosures in Sakurai relative to the claims as currently written.

Independent Claim 21 is directed to an electrical supply device in which a resonance device fixes a frequency of supplying a periodic voltage to first and second electrodes at a resonance frequency of the system, and further includes a switch that is opened and closed over a specific period to fix that frequency. With reference to Figure 1 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, an electrical supply device includes a switch 50 that is switched on and off at a switching period to supply first and second electrodes 20, 21 with a periodic voltage at a resonant frequency of the structure. Applicants submit such a switch is neither taught nor suggested by Sakurai, as now discussed.

---

<sup>1</sup> New Claim 31 is supported by the original specification, see for example page 11, lines 15-17.

First, applicants note the outstanding rejection appears to be taking a completely inconsistent approach in applying Sakurai against the claims.

One basis for the rejection relies on Sakurai to disclose use of a resonance means including the capacitor 16, a switching element 14, and a control device 15 (Office Action of September 5, 2008, page 4, lines 8-12). Another portion in the rejection cites Sakurai to disclose a switching element 45, which the Office Action appears to indicate is switched at a zero crossing of a current flowing through a structure, citing Sakurai at column 13, lines 13-26 (Office Action of September 5, 2008, page 3, lines 13-23).

Applicants note the above-noted grounds for the outstanding rejection is not at all understood as it appears to rely on two *different* switches in Sakurai in an *inconsistent* manner with respect to the claims as written.

The claims recite a “resonance means” including a switch that opens and closes during a period and triggered by a certain instance, and that “resonance means” is a device that fixes the frequency with which first and second electrodes are supplied with a periodic voltage at substantially the resonant frequency of the system of the structure and the inductor. Neither of the switches 14 or 45 in Sakurai operate in that manner, and even the combination of switches 14 and 45 in Sakurai do not operate in that manner.

Moreover, applicants submit it is inconsistent in the outstanding rejection to cite the switch 45 in Sakurai as that switch 45 is not even cited as part of the claimed “resonance means”, that is, the Office Action has not indicated switch 45 is part of the claimed “resonance means”. That switching element 45 in Sakurai clearly does not correspond to the claimed “switch placed in a path from the voltage generator to the primary winding of the transformer” of the claimed “resonance means”. Thereby, the reliance on that switch 45 in Sakurai is completely misplaced.

Moreover, even the cited disclosure in Sakurai at column 13, lines 13-26 is not directed to the claimed features. At that point Sakurai discloses such a switch 45 can operate to cut-off a current flowing through a negative electrode filament so that thereby a DC pulse voltage is applied across a lamp 30. That switch 45 in Sakurai, however, is not at all directed to any type of “resonance means” as claimed, and particularly that noted switch 45 in Sakurai does not fix a frequency of a periodic voltage applied to first and second electrodes at a resonance frequency of the system of the structure and the inductor.

Moreover, the switch 14 in Sakurai also does not operate as the claimed switch in the “resonance means”, and the outstanding Office Action appears to have accepted that position as the outstanding Office Action does not even appear to cite the switch 14 for such features. In any event, applicants note the switch 14 in Sakurai also does not operate to supply first and second electrodes with a periodic voltage at a frequency substantially of the resonant frequency of the system of the structure and the inductor.

Thereby, applicants respectfully submit the outstanding rejection is misconstruing the disclosures in Sakurai relative to the claims as written and Sakurai clearly does not disclose or suggest the claimed “resonance means” as recited in the claims.

Each of the above-noted claims incorporates the above-noted limitations from independent claim 21, and thus each of the claims as written positively distinguishes over Sakurai.

Applicants also note new dependent claim 31 further recites:

wherein the control system opens and closes the switch over a period of  $T = 1/(2fr)$ , in which  $fr$  is the resonant frequency of the system of the structure and the inductor.

Such further features are believed to be neither taught nor suggested by Sakurai, as neither of the noted switches 14 or 45 provide such a control.

Moreover, applicants note no further disclosures in any of the cited art to Coleman, Yoshida, or Lazarovich were cited with respect to the above-noted features, and no further disclosures in Coleman, Yoshida, or Lazarovich are believed to cure the above-discussed deficiencies in Sakurai.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\SNS\28'S\284467\284467US-AM-DUE-12-5-08.DOC